DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 360 EA 016 791

AUTHOR Champagne, David W.; And Others
TITLE Analysis of the Content of Training Programs for Chief School Administrators in the Areas of Instructional Methodology, Curriculum, and Instructional Supervision.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Role; Content Analysis; Curriculum; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Policy Formation; *Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Public Education; School Effectiveness; *State Standards; *Superintendents; Supervision; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to compare the qualities of educational leadership recommended by effective schools research with the actual training and knowledge of district superintendents, the study reported here explores existing training requirements for superintendents in the advanced study of curriculum, instruction, and supervision. The research is a content analysis of three types of documents: (1) an American Association of School Administrators report addressing superintendents' competencies; (2) constitutional, statutory, and regulatory influences on training programs, with particular attention to requirements in Pennsylvania; and (3) documents describing course requirements, expectations, and intents of institutions offering training programs for superintendents. Analysis of 108 training institutions' program descriptions revealed that only 15 percent required coursework in each of the three areas of curriculum, instruction, and supervision, while 26.8 percent required no courses in any of these areas. The data are interpreted as showing that the study of these areas is not a large part of the training of superintendents. Because educational leaders are being called upon to promote school effectiveness, the authors recommend that individual training programs be evaluated and that more uniform and specific criteria for those programs be established. (MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David W. Champagne
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED244360

Analysis of the Content of Training Programs for Chief School Administrators in the Areas of Instructional Methodology, Curriculum, and Instructional Supervision

by

David W. Champagne

John L. Morgan

M. B. R. Rawlings

Danjuma Gwany

University of Pittsburgh

AERA 1984

EA 016 791

This research examines the preparation programs for school superintendents in the areas of instructional supervision, instructional methodology and curriculum. This effort is part of a continuing research focus of the authors. We are trying to identify the roles and impact of leadership in producing effective schools.

We were led to this examination by earlier work of our own and that of our doctoral students. Dowler (1982) investigated the perceptions of school principals of the factors affecting the supervision they provided. One of the factors most often mentioned was their belief that the focus and interest of their superintendent determined the effort and direction of their supervision. The principals in Dowler's sample reported they felt inhibited in the supervisory practices they believed were affected by the disinterest or other foci of their respective superintendents. Champagne and Cobbett (1983) interviewed a sample of school superintendents to determine their knowledge and interest in supervision, instruction and curriculum. The supervisory systems incumbent superintendents had established in their districts to monitor and improve student learning achievement appeared to rest on a weak knowledge base, and seemed to contain major inconsistencies. At the same time the superintendents generally expressed satisfaction with their designs. In each school district we studied, the supervisory system was an idiosyncratic creation of the superintendent. There were major commonalities, but clearly those superintendents had the power, and exercised it, in creating the organizations they desired. We wondered if the type or content of training of the superintendent might contain some explanations for these observations.

Extensive research has clearly shown that effective schools or school systems do not spontaneously come into being. Rather, they are brought into being by effective leadership. This leadership is characterized by a strong focus on the product of education -- learning -- and especially on how learning can be developed and enhanced for <u>both</u> students and school personnel. A school or school system is judged "effective" when it produces learning.

Although competent business management skills are needed for <u>any</u> complex organization to run successfully, school <u>business</u> management does not appear as a key variable in school effectiveness literature. The following five leadership factors taken together appear to create an ethos which is associated with school effectveness, i.e. high student learning. (These are taken from a summary by Thomas Mullikin - Pennsylvania Department of Education.)

1. Leadership -- Effective schools are led by strong principals who are able to manage time and people effectively and efficiently.

2. Time -- Effective schools allocate adequate time for instructional matters.

3. Expectations -- Effective schools hold high expectations for staff and students, provide uniform standards and policies, maintain an orderly environment and foster positive student self-concepts.

4. Management -- Effective schools manage and supervise staff and monitor student progress carefully.

5. Instruction -- Effective schools provide a sequential articulated instructional program for all students.

Other common variables in the research suggest that student achievement also is related to specific instructional techniques and classroom management practices (Squires,et al, 1983, Brophy, 1979, Stallings, 1979, Good, 1979, Edmunds, 1979, Rosenshine, 1983).

Our conclusion from the above is that an effective school leader needs a solid understanding, both theoretical and practical, of the problems addressed by the advanced study of curriculum, instruction and supervision. This leadership must begin with and be reinforced by the superintendent.

Assumptions

We based our efforts in this research on three assumptions:

1. We expect our school superintendents to manage schools effectively.

2. The superintendent is the key individual in setting the expectations and designing effective systems in the school district.

3. The systems superintendents design are based, among other factors, on their knowledge and training.

Design and Method for This Study

This research is a content analysis of documents which describe three areas:

A) The foci and intents of accrediting bodies and professional administrative groups about superintendents competencies and training. We wanted to determine what directions and interests these groups had.

B) Constitutional, legal, and state education department regulations influences on the training programs. To organize this

task clearly we presented these interlocking codes in detail in one representative state, Pennsylvania. Then we presented summaries of these requirements in other states to show the prevailing patterns they create.

C) Documents which institutions having training programs for the school superintendent use to describe their requirements, expectations and intents.

Our purpose in analyzing these data was to present an accurate description of the current training of school superintendents in the three areas of our interest.

We extracted the data from these three sources to answer the following four questions:

1) What are the quantity and relative importance of instructional supervision, instructional methodology, and curriculum studies in the training programs of school superintendents?

2) What is the orientation toward these three areas in these training programs?

3) How similar are the ideas in these training programs to those recommended by school effectiveness research?

4) What is the current state of training of superintendents in the areas of instructional supervision, instructional methodology and curriculum?

The narrative and summary charts presented below present the data we found in the sample of documents sent to us.

Our subsequent analysis of the data looked for consistencies and inconsistencies among these influences. We also suggest some possible explanations for the results we found. Finally, we suggest some implications and make some recommendations for further enquiry in these areas.

Data

A. Accrediting Bodies, and Professional Administrator Organizations.

The literature found in this area is not extensive. The relative influence of the reports and reviews found in this area is not known.

The most prominent studies of superintendents training programs have been done by the A.A.S.A. (American Association of School Administrators) at about 10 year intervals (1960, 1971, 1982). These reviews were as much on the issues facing superintendents and the demographics of those who entered the superintendency as

they were reviews of actual training programs. (For example: In 1971, 79.1% of superintendents had coached athletics before assuming the office. In 1982, this figure had dropped to 42.3%. In 1971, 13.5% of school superintendents were members of the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Devlopment. By 1981, this figure had risen to 18.9%. Perhaps these figures are indicative of trends.)

The major findings of A.A.S.A. were that the doctorate is increasingly held by superintendents and that a course in administrative management science has been added more often than any other, in the training programs (1982).

Roald F. Campbell (Fa' '84) suggests that the superintendent in training has already become most of what (s)he will become before admission to a training program. He, therefore, suggests that most of the effort of universities preparing superintendents should be in the identification and selection process. (Though we note this caution, we still believe a strong knowledge base is necessary.)

The American Association of School Admininstrators established a Committee for the Advancement of School Administration. That committee produced a set of guidelines for the preparation of Superintendents (A.A.S.A.,1979).

In its statement of beliefs about superintendents, (p. 8) are the following:

They should

- understand that the primary focus of education must be on the youth it serves.
- understand educational objectives, methods and practices in order to identify the extent to which schools are or are not achieving desired objectives and to locate areas within the organization where resources are or are not fully utilized.
- understand human relationships and skillfully utilize the dynamics of group processes so that an effective utilization of human resources within the school community can be achieved.

These guidelines also state training recommendations. Among them are the following (p. 11, 12, 13):

" Training institutions should involve practicing administration in the design, development, operation and evaluation of the academic program.

> The academic program in school administration should have the characteristics of a professional school rather than the qualities of the study of a single academic discipline. The preparation should be performance based, field oriented and incorporate concepts, theories and research findings from other academic disciplines."

Although the beliefs, stated above, made general recommendations about curriculum and instruction in the school, none of the actual recommendations for training of this group include the need for a central core of study about the curriculum, the instruction or the actual supervisiory processes to be used in reaching curriculum or instructional goals. The Curriculum of the school settings in which superintendents are to serve, is not mentioned in these preparation guidelines.

B. Constitutional, Legal, and State Depratment of Education Regulations

As a way to make sense of the training program for superintendents, we describe the constitutional, legal and professional influences on the training programs. To do this we take these interdependent codes in one state, Pennsylvania. Then we describe summaries of other states and institutional procedures which effect these training programs' content and structure.

Since Education is a reserved power, the 50 states each have their own regulations. These differ in detail and extent, but rarely in major substance.

The Chief Executive Officer of School districts is called the Superintendent. The Superintendent is,

> " the chief administrative/executive officer of a school district, who, because of the nature of his/her position, sits with the board at regular board meetings, but does not vote. Primarily a coordinating officer who marshalls many functions and specializes toward the accomplishment of the school system's goals."(Good,1959)

The Public School Code of Pennsylvania (1949 and amendments through 1975) lists the duties of the school superintendent. Among many others, they include the following, relevant to the content of this paper (we report these as found in Petrocky, 1977):

> " Article X: (Section 1081) Visit as often as practicable the schools under his supervision to note the courses and methods of instruction, give direction in the art and method of teaching, report to the board any insufficiency found . . .
>
> Article XV: (Section 1512) Approve a course of study

adapted to age, development, and needs of pupils so that the school board can arrange for such course or courses of study to be provided."

To ensure the competence of the persons who take the office of the superintendent and discharge these legal duties the states have established certifications or letters of eligibility for those who are allowed to accept the office. Most states have created regulations which require areas of study for those who will be so certified. These regulations are based on the required legal duties and responsibilities.

In Pennsylvania these regulations are called state standards. The State Department of Education empowers specific universities to offer approved programs of study leading to the Superintendent's letter of eligibility. On completion of this approved program, the University recommends the candidate to the State and the letter of eligibility to accept the position of Superintendent of Schools is awarded. The Standards in Pennsylvania include the following which are relevant to this research:

"Standard VII. The Program shall include studies and activities which increase a candidate's:

a. comprehension of principles and developments concerning the learner and the learning process.
b. knowledge of curriculum and competence in providing curriculum leadership.
c. comprehension of principles and developments in school organization and operation.
d. comprehension of principles and developments in supervision of all professional and non-professional personnel.
e. comprehension of principles and developments in school board relationships, school law, professional personnel responsibilities and negotiations, school finances and public relations.
f. competence in performance and interpretation of research with specific applications to school programs and administration.

This structure and sequence of thought should produce the results intended. From the state constitution, through the laws of the legislature, specific duties are delegated to school superintendents. These are promulgated by state departments of education to become standards that are the basis for training programs approved by the state. Clearly the intent of these requirements, laws, and state standards for training programs include supervision, instruction and curriculum as prominent competencies required for school superintendents.

Other states have similar legal structures. Feldvebel (1981) made a summary of the various guidelines and requirements with his analysis of the documents submitted by 48 of the 50 states. His major findings are presented below:

> "The practice of issuing "all grade" endorsements for superintendents is universal. It reflects the perception that the superintendent's office tends to be more pre-occupied with managerial and leadership functions at the conceptual level . . " (p.17)

All states require a teaching certificate, (almost always with some actual teaching and or supervisory exprierence -- 2 - 3 years is the norm, with the range from 1 - 7 years).

Twenty-one states require a Masters Degree, 8 a Masters Degree plus, 8 a 6th year or Specialists' Certificate and 5 states specified competencies to be fulfilled by graduate coursework. (41 useable responses)

The states also varied in the kind of specificity in their requirements for the superintendency. Twenty-four states specified broad guidelines (e.g. program approval -- Pennsylvania's standards described earlier are in this category.) Two states accepted NCATE types of requirements. Presumably these meant accreditation of the university program by NCATE or a similar accrediting body. Sixteen States required specific courses. (42 useable responses)

Courses most often specified were in Administration (18 states), Supervision (19) states) and Curriculum (17 states). All other specific requirements were named by 9 or fewer states. For example, only 5 specified a required field experience as part of the superintendent's training program.

C. Documents from Institutional Training Programs for Superintendents

1. Andes,et al (1982) did a national survey on courses and organization of 10% Educational Administration Units and Programs. Their analysis of data, which probably are taken from many of the same institutions as ours, is reported in Table 1 below:

Table 1
Course Requirement in Supervision in Andes et al
Survey of Superintendents Training Program

No of Courses of Supervision in Institution Studied	No of Institutions
0	33
1	32
2	23
3	12
4	4
5	4
Total	108

Their category of supervision includes all the courses we would call supervision, instruction and curriculum. They also combined principal and superintendent training programs. Compare these data with those which we present in our next section.

2. Data From Training Institutions Program Documents

Note: We recognize the limitations of these data. Documents are often brief, inexplicit and contain little of the detail which would breath life into what the programs actually do. Still, these documents are official program policy.

Sample

A total of 417 inquiries were sent to colleges and universities that have educational administration programs or departments. (Conley, 1984) We stated that we were doing an analysis of the preparation programs for chief school administrators. We asked these educational administration programs to send us one copy of the documents which described: program requirements, philosophy and expectations for program graduates. A total of 164 (39%) of the educational administration programs returned documents to us. Forty (40) of the program documents were not useable because these institutions only trained principals and not chief school administrators. Sixteen of the sets of documents were either too incomplete or were too brief to use with confidence. A content analysis (Chadwick, et al, 1984) was conducted on the remaining 108 sets of documents.

Six (6) of the preparation programs required a doctorate in order to certify a person as eligible to become a superintendent. Forty seven (47) programs required a Masters Degree. Fifty-five (55) programs did not specify any degree as a necessary part of the preparation program. They reported in terms of graduate credit hours. The mean number of graduate credits required for all 108

programs in the sample was 57.

Our main focus in the analysis was to determine if these educational administrator training programs offered or required courses in the areas of curriculum, supervision and instruction. We also wished to summarize what the program documents stated about the importance or rationale for the study of these three areas.

Supervision

In the area of supervision, 29 of the training institutions offered no courses to those seeking the superintendents' letter of eligibility. Of the 79 institutions which offered courses in supervision, a mean of 5.46 course credits were available (Range 1 - 22 credits). Twenty-six (26) of these courses were in supervisory theory, 30 of these courses were in supervisory skills, and 6 focused on supervisory models.

54/108 programs required no courses in supervision for graduation from their program. Of the 54 which required some supervision, a mean of 7.44 credits were required (range of 1 - 12 credits).

Instruction

In the area of instruction, 59/108 of the training institutions offered no courses to those seeking the superintendents' letter of eligibility. Of the 49 institutions which offered courses in instruction, a mean of 4.5 course credits were available (range 1 - 33 credits). Twenty-one (21) of these courses were in instructional theory, 15 were in instructional research, and 22 focused on modes of instruction.

88/108 programs required no courses in instruction for graduation from their program. Of the 20 which required some instruction, a mean of 3.5 credits were required (range of 1 - 12 credits).

Curriculum

In the area of curriculum, 26/108 of the training institutions offered no courses to those seeking the superintendents letter of eligibility. Of the 82 institutions which offered courses in instruction, a mean of 6.42 course credits were available (Range 1 - 43 credits). Thirty-one (31) of these courses were in curriculum analysis, 38 were in curriculum development, and 23 focused on curriculum evaluation.

33/108 programs required no courses in curriculum for graduation from their program. Of the 75 which required some curriculum, a mean of 2.45 credits were required (range of 1 - 15 credits).

Displaying some of these same data in another way in Table 2, we show which institutions required what distributions of courses in the three areas of our concern.

Table 2
Variety of Requirements in Supervision, Instruction and Curriculum by Program

Category of Requirements	Number of Programs
Required courses in all three areas	N = 16 (15%)
Required courses in two areas	N = 43 (40%)
	SUP'N. & CURRIC. N = 37 (34%)
	C+I N = 4 (3.7%)
	S+I N = 2 (1.8%)
Required courses in only one area	N = 20 (18%)
	SUP'N N = 9 (7.6%)
	CURRIC N = 11 (10.2%)
	INSTR. N = 0
Required no courses in any of three areas	N = 29 (26.8%)

We analyzed all the program documents to determine if they made any statements about the importance of supervision in superintendents' training. Ninety-eight of the training programs said nothing about the importance of supervision. Five of the ten who make some statement refered to a balance between theory and practice in using supervision. The other comments were one each in the following categories: emotional climate of school, staff morale, teacher evaluation, superintendent is required to have two years of supervisory practice before licensing, and, " the program requires study in supervision."

In the area of the importance of instruction, of the 108 useable documents, 103 made no statements about the importance of instruction at all. Four of the five which did make any statement in this area assumed that by having been a teacher the superintendent needed no further knowledge or training about instruction. One document stated that the superintendent would serve as an instructional leader.

When we searched the documents for any statements about the rationale for curriculum competencies, 100 of them said nothing. Of the eight which spoke to this question, all implied or directly said that the superintendent must serve as the leader in efforts to improve, or plan the curriculum. Therefore, it was absolutely necessary (s)he have this background.

In our final search of the documents we looked for some conceptual descriptions they might give of who the superintendent was to become. Seventy-seven (77) of the 108 useable program documents in our sample referred to the superintendent only as -- the superintendent-- with no modifiers or qualifiers. The remaining 31 programs wrote descriptors to share some idea of their program's intent.

Specifically, these statements varied from the most pedestrian descriptions like, "to get jobs done on time," to the superintendent is, "an expert on research on administration, curriculum, instruction, economics, finance, personnel administration, and external relations." Two programs gave detailed lists of duties of the superintendent. Two others gave a long list of detailed competencies. Interestingly when detailed lists were given, they included the curriculum instructional and supervisory competencies <u>not</u> prominently featured in the course requirements of most programs.

Only three programs organized their documents around major conceptual schema which allowed the reader to get some real sense of what was valued by the training institution. We quote only from one, "This program seeks to develop superintendents who can transform their institutions not merely maintain them. "

The Program titles gave us as much a conceptual view of the orientation of the superintendents' training program as the actual documents. Some of these are listed below:

a. Program in Public Policy and Analysis --Major in Educational Administration.
b. Graduate School of Education and Psychology -- Institutional Management
c. Administration and Supervision
d. The Administrative Science Credential
e. Type D. Endorsement
f. Ed.D. Program for Professionals in Metropolitan Society
g. Educational Institute for School Executives
h. Chief School Business Offficial Program
i. Curriculum and Instruction
j. Educational Policy, Planning and Administration

Our general impressions of most of the documents were that they were very detailed and explicit about the varied rules and regulations with which the students must comply, but the descriptions of why the programs required the courses and competencies they did were not featured prominently, if at all. We recognize the need to be very clear about the rules. What we wondered about in reading the documents was the reasons they were so silent on the why of what the students were required to study.

Conclusions from these Data

Analysis of the Four Research Questions

1. What are the quantity and relative importance of instructional supervision, instructional methodology, and curriculum studies in the training programs of school superintendents?

In programs whose mean length is 57 graduate credits, only 16 institutions require study in all three areas. The mean number of credits required for supervision, for those programs which required any at all, is 7.44. Thus, for all programs in the sample, this mean is 3.77 credits.

In the area of instruction, the mean number of credits required, for those who required any is 1.44. For the total sample, this mean drops to less than 1 credit (0.77).

In the area of curriculum, where 75/108 programs required course credits, the mean is 2.45 or just under 2 credits (1.7) for the whole sample.

Thus the mean total for all three areas is 6.24 credits.

Twenty-nine of the programs required no courses in any of the three areas.

Thus 51 credits on the average are in other areas than these three. Stated another way, on the average, 10.9% of the time superintendents are required to spend in their graduate training is required in the areas of supervision, instruction and curriculum.

2. What is the orientation toward these three areas in these training programs?

Only a handful of programs made any written statements of their orientation toward any of these areas. It is impossible to draw any generalizations about the sample from this small number. It is possible to say that there were no strong orientations about any of these three areas expressed in the documents.

3. How similar are the ideas in these training programs to those recommended by school effectiveness research?

Our data are effectively mute on this point. Instructional studies are the area where these issues would most likely appear, and instruction is the least often required of the three areas. On the average less than one credit is required in this area in each program. The only other category of training where this area could possibly be mentioned might be in topics on leadership. We have no indication of whether or not it was mentioned there.

4. What is the current state of training of superintendents in the areas of instructional supervision, instructional methodology and curriculum?

These data show only that the study of these three areas is not a large part of the training of superintendents. We are not convinced by the documents that there is any clear or coherent agreement on the need for this training or on its content or orientation when it is offered. There is no evidence from our data, nor from current or previous A.A.S.A. studies that study of these three areas is increasing or is clearly valued.

Discussion and Conclusions

Our investigation indicates that the training of our most powerful educational leaders -- our superintendents -- is directed mainly to concerns other than those of the learning of students. In fact, a great many superintendent training programs appear to exclude any in-depth study of curriculum, instruction or supervision.

Because school leaders are being called upon to develop educational practices and procedures which promote school effectiveness, it becomes important that their training programs prepare them to do so.

There are three possible kinds of explanations for the failure of the training programs for superintendents to be built on a central core of knowledge about curriculum, supervision and instruction. These are:

a. It is not important for superintendents to know these things.

b. Superintendents learn these ideas and content elsewhere.

c. Superintendents must be expert managers who can/do get their advice about school program, method and supervision from specialists they hire.

Let us take each of these explanations in turn and examine its worth.

A. It is not important for superintendents to know very much about supervision, instruction or curriculum.

This explanation can not withstand any real examination. Doctors need clear and explicit knowledge of physiology and chemistry before they begin to treat patients. Superintendents' knowledge of how learning takes place (instruction), what is to be learned,(curriculum) and how to help those who are teaching (supervision) is as fundamental to superintendents' practice as the knowledge doctors must have.

Superintendents must prepare budgets, allocate resources and elect initiatives they can support. Underlying all superintendents decisions are the knowledge base which give their directions value and consistency. Without a clear understanding of these issues in the program of the school, the result is programatic chaos, bandwagoning of objectives, inconsistent allocation of resources, and planning done without knowledge of its effects. In short, ineffective schools result from this kind of leadership with a weak knowledge base.

These criticisms of schools are exactly those we have heard about and read in the last year of angry hostile finger pointing reports on the state of our schools. Our schools behave as if the leadership does not have that strong knowledge base upon which a clear values set can be built. Of course, superintendents must be good managers, but they must have a strong content of school curriculum instruction and supervision so their management moves the schools in sensible achievable directions.

B. Superintendents learn these ideas and this content in supervision, instruction and curriculum elsewhere.

Specifically, it is implied that superintendents in their required teaching preparation and experience learn all they need to know of these areas. (Most of the training programs for superintendents we studied included those for principals in the

requirements we report here. Thus we are also saying that principals do not study any of these areas in any depth either.)

This is the most reasonable explanation for the relative neglect of required study for superintendents in these three areas, on the surface. If it were true that superintendents learned what they needed to know in these areas in their teacher training then the present training programs would make good sense.

Few, if any, teacher training programs or actual work experience as a teacher make any serious study of any of these three areas. Secondary teachers usually get one methods of teaching course in their own special area of content. This course usually covers the general content of their field, the recommended instructional methods and some ideas on the specific curricular content they are to teach. Educational psychology may cover some instructional theory, but usually not very much. Student teaching, the major component of most teacher training programs is largely an internship which helps the prospective teacher learn to write and teach from lesson plans, and sometimes allows the beginning teacher to write a complete unit and teach it once. Teaching after the license has been granted rarely involves further systematic study of any field. Inservice or other attempts by school districts constitute two to five days per year, on the average. Most of these attempts are perceived by teachers to be disorganized and relatively useless to their practice. They certainly are not any systematic study of curriculum, instruction or supervision.

Elementary teachers are slightly better trained in the instructional methodology of the subjects they will teach. They have no more methodological depth than secondary teachers, but they do get instructional methodology in more of the areas in which they teach. Formal study of instruction or the issues of curriculum design, development analysis, cross school articulation, vertical scope and sequence, are simply not a part of teacher training. These are ideas only begun in graduate work in the special fields of instruction and curriculum theory and design. Supervision is just a word to teachers that equates with evaluation -- whispered about, but never studied. Mastery learning, learning theory, diagnostic models of teaching and evaluation of learning are topics touched in teacher training, but not at the levels superintendents need to know and be able to plan for. School program planning, implementation and evaluation are areas of which superintendents have no experience unless they formally study them in their graduate training. Almost always these issues are considered in curriculum courses and very seldom outside them.

Should superintendents not add the formal study of supervision to their knowledge base, they are likely to design and implement programs which are inadequate and contain fatal flaws which destroy their effectiveness. Without formal study, people tend to use their intuition or their unconscious processing of data. They

either fall back on prevailing "common sense" or manipulative control processes. As any study of management of excellent organization shows, those uncommon organizations do not follow prevailing "common sense" or unconscious intuition in the supervisory systems they use to get their effective results. There are general theorys and specific skills of supervision which need to be studied and understood if our schools are to become alive and effective places.

The explanation that superintendents learn about supervision, instruction and curriculum elsewhere is not an adequate nor correct basis for neglecting formal study of these areas in the superintendents' training programs.

C. Superintendents must be expert managers who can/do get their advice about school program, method and supervision from specialists they hire.

Superintendents of schools are the single professional officials who regularly meet with the school board and give advice. They must establish coherent directions and procedures which the board can support. They must be able to explain and interpret the curriculum, the instructional program and the supervisory and evaluation systems to non-professional citizens. They must understand these concepts well enough to make them intelligible to those for whom schools are an interest, but rarely an area of study. Outside or inside experts can not make and interpret this policy level thinking for superintendents.

And, how can superintendents know how to interpret the advice they must surely seek, when they are making the considered and consistent judgments they must make, if they themselves have no fundamental understanding of the issues involved? Without this self knowledge superintendents are reduced to making uninformed demands and judgments likely to be inconsistent or ineffective. "Put it on one page or I won't read it," or "How much does it cost?" become the criteria of worth.

The rest of this argument is that in <u>most</u> school districts the superintendents are, with the business manager, the only school professionals in the district who have a system wide perspective and responsibility. They do not have a team of advisors, curriculum specialists or supervisors to which to turn. There aren't any. Most school districts are too small for this staff. And, these specialists, where they used to exist, have largely been cut because superintendents did not know why they needed them or how to defend their importance. The only way any of us can usefully receive advice is to be able to understand that base from which it is given. Even with good advisors, superintendents must themselves be responsible and knowledgeable about their decisions in these three areas. Our schools are now being criticized because they appear not to be behaving consistently or responsibly in these program and content areas which form the

core of what we are about. The wonder is that schools do as well as they do with such a weak knowledge base at the top.

Thus, the three explanations above do not give adequate reasons for the dirth of curriculum, supervision, and instruction credit requirements in various superintendents' training programs.

Although our sample of training programs and our analysis does show wide variation in program requirements and conceptualization, it appears that the professors who design educational administrators' programs are, in many cases, making the assumption that sufficient expertise in curriculum, supervision, and instruction have already been acquired by the superintendents-in-training via their previous training or via their experience in education. This conclusion is the only one tenable since almost no one, at least publically, denies the superintendents' need to know these areas of study.

Possibly the time has come to take a close look at specific superintendents' training programs to evaluate whether or not each is actually providing the training needed for effective school leaders, and to then establish more uniform and specific criteria for these training programs which will be built around the core of learning in the school program and its reinforcement through conceptually sound supervisory systems.

In 1910, Abraham Flexner (1910) released his famous report on medical training for doctors. Within 10 years, approximately half of the training programs then extant had closed their doors. Most of the rest had reformed their curricula to conform with the recommendations of the Flexner Carnegie Commission. Are we at that stage in our development?

Bibliography

Mullikin, Thomas, "Approaching the Research on Effective Schools and Effective Teaching," The Mentor, V3 No. 1, Doctoral Association of Educators, University of Pittsburgh, Spring 1982, p. 3.

Squires, D.A., et al, Effective Schools and Classrooms: A Research-Based Perspective, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Va., 1983.

Brophy, J.E., "Advances in Teacher Research" Journal of Classroom Interaction, v 15:1, p. 1-7., Winter 1979.

Stallings, J.A., "The Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in Secondary Schools", S.R.I.International ,Menlo Park, CA., 1979.

Good,T.L., "Teacher Expectations and Student Perceptions: A Decade of Research,"Educational Leadership, 1979, 37:1, p.39 - 45.

Edmunds, R.L., "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," Educational Leadership, 1979, v 37:1, p. 15-24.

Rosenshine, Barak, "Teaching Functions in Instructional Programs" Elementary School Journal, Vol. 83, No 4, March 1983.

Dowler, J.B., An Analysis of Principals' Perceptions of Supervisory Behavior, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1982.

American Association of School Administrators, Profile of the School Superintendent, Washington, D.C.,1960.

Knezevich, S.J.(ed.), Commission on thr Preparation of Professional School Administrators, Preparation for the American School Superintendency, A.A.S.A., Washington, D.C., 1972.

Cuningham, L. L., et al, The American School Superintendency 1982: A Summary Report, A.A.S.A., 1982.

Campbell, R.F.," The World of the School Superintendent," N.Y.U. Education Quarterly, Fall, 1974, p. 14 ff.

Good,(ed.), Dictionary of Education, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill Book Co., Carter, VA.,1959,p. 571.

Petrocky, M.G., Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, School Laws of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg: Department of Education,1971, as quoted in Identification of Statuatory Duties of the School

Board and the Superintendent of Schools as Enumerated in the Public School Code of 1949 and the Status of Execution of Certain Statuatory Duties in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Unpublished Doctoral Disseration, University of Pittsburgh, 1977, p.146 ff.

Feldvebel, A.M., Review of State Standards for the Initial Certification of Administrators and Supervisors, paper presented at Annual Meeting of National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Seattle, WA., Aug. 16-21.

Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators: Superintendent Career Development Series, No. 1., A.A.S.A., 1801, N. Moore Street, Arlington, VA., 22209, 1979.

Andes, J., et al, A National Study on Courses and Organization of Education(al) Administration and Higher Education(al) Administration Units and Programs, unpublished document, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV., Sept.,1982, (used with Permission), p. 7.

Conley, Diane,ed., Peterson's Annual Guides/Graduate School Book 2: Graduate Programs in the Humanities and Social Sciences, 18th ed. Peterson's Guides, Princeton, N.J., 1984, p. 680 ff.

Chadwick, B.A., et al, Social Science Research Methods, Prentice Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1984.

Flexner, A., Medical Education in the United States and Canada: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910.